UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,421	03/31/2004	Syed F.A. Hossainy	50623.359	7688
Cameron K. Ke	7590 04/14/200 errigan	EXAMINER		
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P. Suite 300 1 Maritime Plaza			SILVERMAN, ERIC E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
San Francisco,	CA 94111	1618		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/815,421	HOSSAINY, SYED F.A.		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	Eric E. Silverman, PhD	1618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>03 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be f	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will <u>not</u> be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor	•	E below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying ti	ne issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	on openating manifest or mixing reju	otou olamio.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alle		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).	· 	·	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) rejected Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
			
/Michael G. Hartley/			
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants aver that the office is incorrect in relying on the definition of block copolymer in the specification. Specifically, Applicant notes that the definition of block copolymer in the art is a polymer having two or more blocks of different monomers. While that is the starndar definition in the art, it is recognized that Applicants may be their own lexicographers, and when Applicant clearly redefines a term in the specification so as to put the artisan on notice of the meaning that Applicant applies to the term, it is Applicants definition that governs. Here, the specification clearly redefines the term block copolymer to include situations where the two blocks are not linked at the end, which, when interpreted broadly but reasonably, includes situations where the blocks are not chemically bound to one another. The prosecution history has been quite clear as to the meaning attached to Applicants definition. Further, Applicant has had ample opportunity to amend the claims to require that the ends of the block copolymer be linked, but has declined to do so. Applicants' arguments are therefore not persuasive.

Continuation of 13. Other: Regarding Applicants' comments about various information disclosure statements, Office records indicate that every information disclosure statement that was submitted in this Application has been returned to Applicant . Contrarty to Applicants' allegations, Office records do not indicate that any submission was filed on 9/7/2005. Irrespective of Applicant's assumptions, only those references that are listed on an IDS and initialled by the Examiner as having been considered, pursuant to applicable sections of the CFR and MPEP, were actually considered. Applicants assumptions do not trump Office rules and policies. Additional references may be considered if listed on an IDS that is submitted to the Office in a timely fashion .